

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| School Name: Yulee High School | District Name: Nassau County School District |
| Principal: Dr. DeArmas Graham | Superintendent: Dr. John Ruis |
| SAC Chair: Thomas Blake | Date of School Board Approval: Pending |

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

Administrators

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year) |
|---------------------|--------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Principal | Dr. DeArmas Graham | B.A.,M.S., and Ed. D /Educational Leadership (K-12), Health Education (K-12) | 6 | 10 | <p>2011-2012 School Grade: Pending. FCAT Proficiency:60 % Reading/74 % Math. FCAT Learning Gains 61% Reading /86% Math. FCAT Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 62% Reading 85% Math.</p> <p>2010-2011 School Grade: B. FCAT Proficiency: 48% Reading/ 79% Math. FCAT Learning Gains % Reading /66% Math. FCAT Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 43% Reading/30% Math.</p> <p>2009-2010 School Grade: B. FCAT Proficiency:55% Reading/ 82% Math. FCAT Learning Gains 56% Reading /78% Math. FCAT Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 43% Reading/61% Math.</p> <p>2008-2009 School Grade: A. FCAT Proficiency: 49% Reading/ 80% Math. FCAT Learning Gains 57% Reading /85% Math. FCAT Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 57% Reading/74% Math.</p> <p>2007-2008 School Grade: D. FCAT Proficiency: 48% Reading/ 74% Math. FCAT Learning Gains 54% Reading /73% Math. FCAT Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 39% Reading/58% Math.</p> <p>2006-2007 School Grade: C. FCAT Proficiency: 41% Reading/ 72% Math. FCAT Learning Gains 46% Reading /71% Math. FCAT Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 39% Reading/67% Math.</p> |
| Assistant Principal | NaTasha Drake | B.A.,M.S./ Educational Leadership (K-12), English (6-12), Reading Endorse, National Board Certified | 3 | 3 | <p>2011-2012 School Grade: Pending. FCAT Proficiency:60 % Reading/74 % Math. FCAT Learning Gains 61% Reading /86% Math. FCAT Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 62% Reading 85% Math.</p> <p>2010-2011 School Grade: B. FCAT Proficiency: 48% Reading/ 79% Math. FCAT Learning Gains % Reading /66% Math. FCAT Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 43% Reading/30% Math.</p> <p>2009-2010 School Grade: Pending. FCAT Proficiency:55% Reading/ 82% Math. FCAT Learning Gains 56% Reading /78% Math. FCAT Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 43% Reading/61% Math.</p> |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|--------------|---------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Reading | Sharla Parker | B.A./English 6-12/ESOL K-12/Reading Endorsement | 3 | 3 | <p>2011-2012 School Grade: Pending. FCAT Proficiency:60 % Reading/74 % Math. FCAT Learning Gains 61% Reading /86% Math. FCAT Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 62% Reading 85% Math.</p> <p>2010-2011 School Grade: B. FCAT Proficiency: 48% Reading/ 79% Math. FCAT Learning Gains % Reading /66% Math. FCAT Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 43% Reading/30% Math.</p> <p>2009-2010 School Grade: Pending. FCAT Proficiency:55% Reading/ 82% Math. FCAT Learning Gains 56% Reading /78% Math. FCAT Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 43% Reading/61% Math.</p> |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. New Teacher Orientation | Principal | August 2011 |
| 2. Weekly Meetings for new teachers | National Certified Teacher | Continuous |
| 3. New Teacher Mentor Program | Principal | Continuous |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 4. | | |
|----|--|--|

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only). | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| N/A- All of our teachers are highly qualified and have earned an effective rating. | |

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| Total number of Instructional Staff | % of first-year teachers | % of teachers with 1-5 years of experience | % of teachers with 6-14 years of experience | % of teachers with 15+ years of experience | % of teachers with Advanced Degrees | % of teachers with an Effective rating or higher | % of Reading Endorsed Teachers | % of National Board Certified Teachers | % of ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 53 | 9% (5) | 19% (10) | 43% (23) | 25% (13) | 38% (20) | 100% (53) | 19% (10) | 13% (7) | 11% (6) |

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school’s teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Natalie Faulk | Claudia Dombkowski | Department Chair | Collaboration throughout the school year during PLC, Department |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| | | | Meetings, and as needed |
| Cheryl Wilkes | David Price | Teacher within the CTE Department | Collaboration throughout the school year during PLC, Department Meetings, and as needed |
| Natalie Faulk | Rita Collins | Department Chair | Collaboration throughout the school year during PLC, Department Meetings, and as needed |
| Natalie Faulk | Caroline Bureau-Lacand | Department Chair | Collaboration throughout the school year during PLC, Department Meetings, and as needed |
| Candace Hicken | Martin Berry | Athletic Director | Collaboration throughout the school year during PLC, Department Meetings, and as needed |
| Richard Schweitzer | Lourdes Rivera | Department Chair | Collaboration throughout the school year during PLC, Department Meetings, and as needed |
| Richard Schweitzer | Sarah Bell | Department Chair | Collaboration throughout the school year during PLC, Department Meetings, and as needed |
| Ethan Dombkowski | Jonathan Willis | Department Chair | Collaboration throughout the school year during PLC, Department Meetings, and as needed |
| Dominique Cook | Andrew Avent | Department Chair | Collaboration throughout the school year during PLC, Department Meetings, and as needed |
| Melissa Meyer | Derica Brown | Teacher within the Math Department | Collaboration throughout the school year during PLC, Department Meetings, and as needed |
| Dominique Cook | Kellie Lee | Department Chair | Collaboration throughout the school year during PLC, Department Meetings, and as needed |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

| |
|---|
| Title I, Part A |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant |
| Title I, Part D |
| Title II |
| Title III |
| Title X- Homeless |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) |
| Violence Prevention Programs |
| Nutrition Programs |
| Housing Programs |
| Head Start |
| Adult Education |
| Career and Technical Education |
| Job Training |
| Other |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

| School-Based MTSS/RtI Team |
|--|
| Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. The MTSS core team consists of: Administrator, school counselor, reading coach, department heads, and teachers. |
| Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The MTSS leadership team is responsible for ensuring that the school has in place a system that provides increasingly intense and individualized interventions, resources and supports needed to meet the unique needs of its students. In order to identify those needs, the team must analyze data to determine deficits and other areas in need of improvement. The team looks at academic, attendance and behavior related data. As the team disaggregates the data, it is identifying which students are meeting grade level expectations and which are not. It is looking for patterns and trends in the data. Leading questions: Are certain groups of students failing to meet expectations in certain subjects? Or, are there certain groups who have other non-academic barriers to achievement that must be addressed before they will be able to meet academic success? Are there trends in achievement within specific subgroups that need to be addressed? Once those areas of need have been identified, the leadership team disseminates this information to the departments, literacy teams and other school based teams. They will assist in determining appropriate research based interventions to remediate specific deficits and identify other available resources to meet individual student needs. The departments/teams oversee the implementation of the interventions and monitor student progress through regularly scheduled meetings. The progress monitoring information will be shared with the departments/teams, and together they will monitor the effectiveness of interventions through student progress monitoring data and fidelity checks. |
| Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The RtI problem solving process provides the framework for developing the SIP. This framework requires schools to identify problems within the general population of students and within subgroups of students, analyze why the problems are occurring and formulate an intervention plan and then measure the effectiveness of the interventions through regular progress monitoring. Their plan to address and remediate areas of deficit becomes the basis for the school improvement plan. |
| MTSS Implementation |
| Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Tier I-Data sources: FCAT 2.0, FAA, EOCs in Algebra I, Geometry, Biology, PERT, ACT, SAT. Data programs: FOCUS, PMRN, FCAT Data Star Tier II-Program specific data for Tier II instruction- READ 180 Next Generation, Achieve 3000, Study Island Tier III- PMP student individualized progress monitoring plans |
| Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The District RtI Specialist, district support personnel, and Florida Department of Education online RtI introductory course are available |
| Describe the plan to support MTSS. District Problem Solving/Response to Intervention Process Implementation Guide |

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| School-Based Literacy Leadership Team |
|---|
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).Administration, Reading Coach, Media Specialist, Department heads and teachers. |
| Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team is to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building, to identify literacy goals and to develop an action plan to achieve those goals. The principal, reading coach, mentor reading teachers, content area teachers, and other principal appointees will serve in this role. Literary Leadership teams meet regularly to address professional development in literacy, content area literacy initiatives, and reading intervention programs. The principal and reading/literacy coach at the school chair or co-chair these meetings. |
| What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The LLT will support instructional strategies to improve reading comprehension and the Common Core State Standards for College and Career Readiness in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language. The LLT team will provide professional development throughout the year to ensure that text complexity, along with close reading and rereading of texts, is central to lessons, to provide scaffolding that does not preempt or replace text reading by students, to develop and ask text dependent questions from a range of question types, to emphasize that students support their answers based upon evidence from the text, and to provide extensive research and writing opportunities. |

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

**Grades 6-12 Only* Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

The Reading Coach, along with the principal and Literacy Leadership Team employ research-based strategies to support reading/writing instruction across the curriculum. The Reading Coach provides professional development activities to engage all teachers through Professional Learning Communities. Students' mastery of the Common Core State Standards, FCAT 2.0, ACT, SAT, and PERT requires a unified approach by all teachers to meet the particular challenges of reading and writing in each subject area. Teachers' use of high quality complex text will provide a context for building language and vocabulary. By extracting information from more complex informational text, using text evidence to explain and justify an argument in discussion and writing, analyzing and critiquing the effectiveness and quality of an author's writing style, presentation, or argument, students reading skills will become more highly developed. Monitoring the effectiveness of this goal will include: classroom walkthrough data, program data, progress monitoring data, lesson plans, and student artifacts.

**High Schools Only*

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Career and technical teachers collaborate to engage students in cognitively complex tasks involving hypothesis generation and testing.

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Efforts to support the development of students' academic and career plans include large group presentations, classroom presentations, parent workshops and individual conferences with students throughout their high school careers. Resources include student handbooks, the Student Progression Plan, Registration Guides, College and Career Fairs, and Financial Aid Workshops. Family involvement in the planning process includes notification of activities through School Reach, school websites, and school newsletters.

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

Schools recognize students who meet Florida's "College Ready Scholar" criteria. To meet that goal and based on analysis of assessment data, students may be provided with additional support through courses such as Intensive Reading, Math for College Readiness, Math for College Success, and English 4 Florida College Prep.

Career technical programs offer certification opportunities for students in Food Service Management (Serve Safe), Certified Nursing Assistant, EMT, ADOBE Flash, National Center for Construction Education and Research: Level 1 Electrical and HVAC Level 1 and 2, Microsoft Office Specialist, and ADOBE Photo Shop. Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement courses provide opportunities for students to engage in college-level coursework while enrolled in high school.

In addition, the "2012-2013 District Reading Remediation Guidelines" stipulates that students scoring below the college readiness level for writing will be required to receive remediation for college readiness in writing during their senior year through the course option: "English 4 Florida College Prep."

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| Reading Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. | | | 1A.1. Students may fail to see the connection between classroom activities and learning goals. | 1A.1. Teachers will develop clearly stated learning goals accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance to help students see the connections between classroom activities and learning goals. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework) | 1A.1. Student, Teacher, and Administrator | 1A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 1A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs |
| Reading Goal #1A: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| The percentage of students achieving a Level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0 reading assessment will increase. | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 30% (217).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 33% (197).</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2 Students may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests. | 1A.2 Teacher will make connections between students' interests and class content to engage students in the learning process. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework) | 1A.2. Student, Teacher, and Administrator | 1A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 1A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs |
| | | | 1A.3 Data analysis is necessary to support targeted instruction to improve student achievement. | 1A.3. <u>Teachers will utilize FAIR, *Study Island, Achieve 3000, and FCAT explorer data to target instruction to improve student achievement</u> | 1A.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 1A.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 1A.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| | | 1A4 Assessments from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need technology support. | 1A4 Request district assistance for technology support. | 1A4 Student, Teacher, and Administrative feedback | 1A4 Request district assistance | 1A4 Request district assistance |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. | | 1B1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning. | 1B.1. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and scales (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System , Marzano’s Art and Science of Teacher Framework), and will utilize district purchased programs and software to track student progress. | 1. B1. School administration and classroom teacher | 1.B1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration | 1.B1. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| Reading Goal #1B: <i>The percentage of student scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the FAA will increase.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | |
| | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 55% (5).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 58% (3).</i> | | | | |
| | | | 1B2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced | 1B.2. Teachers will help students identify critical information, organize new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information(PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano’s Art and Science of Teacher Framework) | 1B.2. School administration and classroom teacher | 1B.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration. |
| | | 1B3. Students may struggle to retain content that they have already learned. | 1B.3. Teachers will help students review content, practice and deepen knowledge, practice skills, strategies, and processes. (Marzano’s Art and Science of Teacher Framework) | 1B3. School administration and classroom teacher | 1B.3. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration | 1B.3. Florida Alternate Assessment |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| 2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading. | | | 2A.1. Students may not be engaged in cognitively complex tasks. | 2A.1. Teachers will incorporate common core state standards for literacy to challenge students to higher levels of achievement. | 2A.1. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 2A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 2A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs |
| Reading Goal #2A: <i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment will increase.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 32% (247).</i> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 35% (208).</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 2A.2. Students may need assistance to interact with new knowledge. | 2A.2. Teachers will implement Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework and the associated research-based instructional strategies in every classroom. | 2A.2. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 2A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 2A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs |
| | | | 2A.3. Assessments from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need technology support. | 2A.3. Request district assistance for technology support. | 2A.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator, District Technology Department | 2A.3. Request district assistance | 2A.3. Request district assistance |
| 2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading. | | | 2B1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning. | 2B1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student progress (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework) | 2B1. School administration and classroom teacher | 2B1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration | 2B1. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| Reading Goal #2B: <i>The percent of students scoring at or above level 7 will maintain or increase.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 22% (2).</i> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 35% (2).</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 2B.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced. | 2B.2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help | 2B.2. School administration and classroom teacher | 2B.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs | 2B.2. Florida Alternate Assessment |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | | students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano’s Art and Science of Teacher Framework,) | | by school administration. | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. | | 3A.1. Students may require intensive and differentiated instruction in reading. | 3A.1. Teachers will use research based instructional strategies and utilize programs that provide differentiated instruction for all students, including Read 180, Achieve 3000, and Study Island. | 3A.1. Student, Teacher, Reading Coach, Media Specialist and Administrator | 3A.1. Program reports, assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk- throughs | 3A.1. Program reports, assessment data, student interview, administrative walk-throughs | |
| Reading Goal #3A: <i>The percentage of students making learning gains in FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 64% (312).</i> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be (67% (332).</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 3A.2. Assessments from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may require additional support. | 3A.2. Request district assistance for technology support. | 3A.2. Request district assistance | 3A.2 Student, Teacher and Administrator feedback | 3A.2. Request district assistance |
| | | | 3A.3 Students may not be organized to practice and deepen knowledge | 3A.3. Teachers will implement strategies from Marzano’s Art and Science of Teaching Framework and utilize READ 180, Achieve 3000, and Study Island to increase student achievement. | 3A.3. Student, Teacher, Reading Coach, Media Specialist and Administrator | 3A.3. Program reports, assessment data, student interview, administrative walk-throughs | 3A.3. Program reports, assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs. |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. | | | 3B1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning. | 3B1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student progress (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano’s Art and Science of Teacher Framework). | 3B1. School administration and classroom teacher | 3B1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration | 3B1. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| Reading Goal #3B: On the FAA, the percentage of students making learning gains will increase. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 25% (2).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 28% (3).</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced | 3B.2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano’s Art and Science of Teacher Framework) | 3B.2. School administration and classroom teacher | 3B2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration. | 3B2. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | | | 4A.1. Lower quartile students may not be fully engaged in the learning process. | 4A.1. Teachers will communicate high expectations for all students, will assist students to interact with new knowledge, and will provide practice of skills, strategies and processes to improve the | 4A.1. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 4A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-through | 4A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-through |
| Reading Goal #4: The percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in FCAT 2.0 Reading will | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 62 (325).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 65% (377).</i> | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| increase. | | | | performance of lower quartile students. (Marzano’s Art and Science of Teaching Framework) Nassau County’s District Reading Plan will be implemented for students who score at Level 1 or Level 2 on FCAT Reading and who have intervention needs in the areas of decoding and/or text reading. | Reading Coach, Counselor, Administrator | Data Analysis: FCAT 2.0, Read 180, Achieve 3000, Study Island | Data Analysis: FCAT 2.0, Read 180, Achieve 3000, Study Island | |
| | | | | 4A.2 Assessment data from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need additional technology support. | 4A 2. Request district assistance for technology support. | 4A.2. Request district assistance | 4A.2. Student, Teacher and administrative feedback | 4A.2. Request district assistance |
| | | | | 4A.3 Lower quartile students may require additional support to process new information. | 4A 3. Teachers will employ strategies to chunk content into digestible bites, elaborate on new information and record and represent new knowledge. (Marzano’s Art and Science of Teaching Framework) | 4A.3. Student, Teacher, Reading Coach, Administrator | 4A.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 4A.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs |
| | | | | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years | | | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 | | BLACK 38% | BLACK 46% | BLACK 51% | BLACK 57% | BL. 62% | BL. 68% | | | | | |
| | | | HISPANIC 76 % | HISPANIC 64% | HISPANIC 68 % | HISPANIC 71% | HISP. 75% | HISP. 79% | | | | | |
| | | | WHITE 61% | WHITE 67% | WHITE 70% | WHITE 73% | WH. 77% | WH. 80% | | | | | |
| | <u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>The overall achievement gap in reading will reduce.</i> | | SWD 35% | SWD 60% | SWD 55% | SWD 60% | SWD 65% | SWD 70% | | | | | |
| | | | ECON. Dis. 50% | ECON. DIS. 61% | ECON. DIS. 65% | ECON. DIS. 69% | E.D. 73% | E.D. 77% | | | | | |
| <table border="1"> <tr><td>BLACK 35%</td></tr> <tr><td>HISPANIC 57%</td></tr> <tr><td>WHITE 60%</td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td>SWD 40%</td></tr> <tr><td>ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED 53%</td></tr> </table> | | | BLACK 35% | HISPANIC 57% | WHITE 60% | | SWD 40% | ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED 53% | | | | | |
| BLACK 35% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HISPANIC 57% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHITE 60% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD 40% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED 53% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | | | | |
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | | 5B.1. | 5B.1. Teachers will develop clearly stated learning goals accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance to help students see the connections between classroom activities and learning goals. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework) | 5B.1. Student, Teacher, and Administrator | 5B.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 5B.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | | | | | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | Students within the subgroups may fail to see the connection between classroom activities and learning goals. | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>The overall performance of students not making satisfactory progress will decrease.</i> | <i>The 2012 current level of performance not making AYP for the following subgroups are as follows:</i> White: 37% (223) Black: 72% (45) Hispanic: 0 (3) TOTAL Asian: 16% (4) American Indian: 26% (5) | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: 34% (173) Black: 69% (50) Hispanic: 62% (5) Asian: 13% (2) American Indian: 23% (4) | | | | | | | | | | | |

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| | | 5B.2 All students within the subgroups may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests. | 5B.2 Teacher will make connections between students' interests and class content to engage students in the learning process. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework) | 5B.2. Student, Teacher, and Administrator | 5B.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 5B.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs |
| | | 5B.3 Data analysis is necessary to support targeted instruction to improve student achievement. | 5B..3.. <u>Teachers will utilize FAIR , *Study Island, Achieve 3000, and FCAT explorer data to target instruction to improve student achievement</u> | 5B.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 5B..3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs | 5B..3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | | 5C.1. ELLs have not had enough time in the ESOL program to become proficient with English to pass the test. Average time for ELLs to be proficient is 3-5 years. However, each ELL is different based on support from home and literacy levels of parents. | 5C.1. Teachers and ELL paraprofessional will continue to work with ELLs at their level, making the needed accommodations with the content area material. Involve ELLs in Community in Schools for reinforcement and assistance with assignments and homework. | 5C.1. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach. | 5C. 1. Data analysis | 5C.1. Ongoing progressing monitoring data |
| <u>Reading Goal #5C:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> :* <i>6-8 =12% proficient in FCAT reading</i> <i>9-12=14% proficient in FCAT reading</i> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> :* <i>6-8=will increase the proficiency level of performance in FCAT reading</i> <i>9-12=will increase the proficiency level of performance in FCAT reading</i> | | | | | |
| ELL students will increase their FCAT reading level of performance in grades 6-8 and 9-12 for the 2012-2013 school year. | | | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2. Not enough ESOL endorsed teachers who know strategies when working with ELLs at the different English levels. | 5C.2. Provide more ESOL endorsed teachers for ELLs at schools with a large ELL population. | 5C.2. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach. | 5C.2. Staff certifications | 5C.2. Staff certifications |
| | | | 5C.3. Lesson plans will be modified for the English level of each ELL, especially beginning and low intermediate ELLs. | 5C.3. Check to make sure teachers are using the ELLs LEP Plan when making lesson plans. | 5C.3. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach. | 5C.3. Review of lesson plans | 5C.3. Ongoing progressing monitoring data |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | 5C.4 ELLs who have been in the program five years or longer. The gap between their grade level and performance is not closing is indicative of an ongoing need for increased intervention with MTSS. | 5C: 4 MTSS team to address concerns | 5C:4 MTSS personnel | 5C:4 Review individual progress monitoring plans. | 5C:4 Ongoing progressing monitoring data |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | 5D.1. The SWD population may have a broad range of needs and accommodations. | 5D.1. Teachers will identify needs of SWD and provide accommodations and modifications specific to each student. | 5D.1. Classroom teachers and school administration | 5D.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring | 5D.1. In class assessments and FCAT |
| <u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> <i>Students with disabilities will increase their FCAT reading level.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | |
| | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 76% (43).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 70% (42).</i> | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. SWD may learn at a slower rate. | 5D.2. Teachers will provide SWD with repetition and reinforcement for skill development. | 5D.2. Classroom teachers | 5D.2. In class assessments and progress monitoring. |
| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | | 5E.1. Teachers may be unaware of the situations faced by ED students. | 5E.1. Teachers will identify and consider needs of ED students and provide interventions as needed. | 5E.1. Classroom teachers | 5E.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring | 5E.1. FCAT |
| Reading Goal #5E: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 48% (103).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 45% (110).</i> | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged students will increase the percentage scoring 3 and above on FCAT reading. | | | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. |
| | | | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. |

Reading Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Read 180 | 9, 10 | Scholastic Consultant | English/Reading Block Teachers | Summer, 2012 Winter, 2012 | Leadership Dashboard | CRT, Building Administrator, Reading Coach, Teacher |
| Achieve 3000 | 9, 10 | Achieve 3000 Consultant | Grade 9, 10, English Teachers | Summer, 2012 Winter, 2012 | System Data Analysis | CRT, Building Administrator, Reading Coach, Teacher |
| Study Island | 9 - 12 | Study Island Consultant | Teachers in core subject areas | Summer, 2012 Fall, 2012 | System Data Analysis | Building Administrator, Reading Coach, Media Specialist, Teacher |
| Marzano Art & Science of Teacher Evaluation Model | 9-12 | Staff and Program Development Office | Teachers and Building Administrators | Ongoing | Teacher assessments | Administrators |
| Common Core Standards: An Overview | 6-12 | Beacon Educator | Secondary Teachers | Fall/Winter 2012 | Review of Professional Activity Implementation report. | Staff Development Administration |

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials . ***All resources funded by District | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of Reading Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| CELLA Goals | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| <p>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</p> <p>CELLA Goal #1:</p> <p>The percentage of students proficient in CELLA listening/speaking will increase in grades 6-8 and 9-12 for the 2012-2013 school year</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u></p> <p>6-8=47% 9-12=77%.</p> | <p>1.1. ELLs have not had enough time in the ESOL program to become proficient with English to pass the test. Average time for ELLs to be proficient is 3-5 years. However, each ELL is different based on support from home and literacy levels of parents.</p> | <p>1.1. Teachers and ELL paraprofessional will continue to work with ELLs at their level, making the needed accommodations with the content area material.</p> <p>Involve ELLs in Community in Schools for reinforcement and assistance with assignments and homework.</p> | <p>1.1. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.</p> | <p>1.1.Data analysis</p> | <p>1.1.CELLA</p> |
| | | <p>1.2. Not enough ESOL endorsed teachers who know strategies when working with ELLs at the different English levels.</p> | <p>1.2. Provide more ESOL endorsed teachers for ELLs at schools with a large ELL population.</p> | <p>1.2. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.</p> | <p>1.2. Review teacher certifications, ESOL certifications, and teachers working towards endorsement.</p> | <p>1.2. Teacher Certification</p> |
| | | <p>1.3. Lesson plans modified for the English level of each ELL, especially beginning and low intermediate ELLs.</p> | <p>1.3. Check to make sure teachers are using the ELLs LEP Plan when making lesson plans.</p> | <p>1.3. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.</p> | <p>1.3. Administrative walk throughs, teacher assessments</p> | <p>1.3. IObservation.</p> |
| | | <p>1.4 ELLs who have been in the program five years or longer. The gap between their grade level and performance is not closing is indicative of an ongoing need for increased intervention with MTSS.</p> | <p>1.4 MTSS team to address concerns.</p> | <p>1.4 MTSS personnel</p> | <p>1.4 Data Analysis</p> | <p>1.4 CELLA</p> |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. Data analysis | 2.1.CELLA |
| <p>CELLA Goal #2: The percentage of students proficient in CELLA reading will increase in grades 6-8 and 9-12 for the 2012-2013 school year</p> | <p>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 6-8=35% 9-12=38%</p> | <p>ELLs have not had enough time in the ESOL program to become proficient with English to pass the test. Average time for ELLs to be proficient is 3-5 years. However, each ELL is different based on support from home and literacy levels of parents.</p> | <p>Teachers and ELL paraprofessional will continue to work with ELLs at their level, making the needed accommodations with the content area material. Involve ELLs in Community in Schools for reinforcement and assistance with assignments and homework.</p> | <p>Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.</p> | | |
| | | <p>2.2. Not enough ESOL endorsed teachers who know strategies when working with ELLs at the different English levels.</p> | <p>2.2. Provide more ESOL endorsed teachers for ELLs at schools with a large ELL population</p> | <p>2.2. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.</p> | <p>2.2. Review teacher certifications, ESOL certifications, and teachers working towards endorsement.</p> | <p>2.2. Teacher Certification</p> |
| | | <p>2.3. Lesson plans modified for the English level of each ELL, especially beginning and low intermediate ELLs.</p> | <p>2.3. Check to make sure teachers are using the ELLs LEP Plan when making lesson plans.</p> | <p>2.3. Principal, assistant principal, counselors & reading coach.</p> | <p>2.3. Administrative walk throughs, teacher assessments</p> | <p>2.3. IObservation</p> |
| | | <p>2.4 ELLs who have been in the program five years or longer. The gap between their grade level and performance is not closing is indicative of an ongoing need for increased intervention with MTSS.</p> | <p>2.4 MTSS team to address concerns</p> | <p>2.4 MTSS personnel</p> | <p>2.4 Data analysis</p> | <p>2.4 CELLA</p> |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|-----------------------------|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. | | 3.1. ELLs have not had enough time in the ESOL program to become proficient with English to pass the test. Average time for ELLs to be proficient is 3-5 years. However, each ELL is different based on support from home and literacy levels of parents. | 3.1. Teachers and ELL paraprofessionals will continue to work with ELLs at their level, making the needed accommodations with the content area material. Involve ELLs in Community in Schools for reinforcement and assistance with assignments and homework. | 3.1. Administration, counselors & reading coach. | 3.1 Data analysis | 3.1 CELLA |
| <p><u>CELLA Goal #3:</u> The percentage of students proficient in CELLA writing will increase in grades 6-8 and 9-12 for the 2012-2013 school year</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u> 6-8=29% 9-12=62%</p> | | | | | |
| | | 3.2. Not enough ESOL endorsed teachers who know strategies when working with ELLs at the different English levels. | 3.2. Provide more ESOL endorsed teachers for ELLs at schools with a large ELL population. | 3.2. Administration | 3.2. Review teacher certifications, ESOL certifications, and teachers working towards endorsement. | 3.2. Teacher certifications |
| | | 3.3. Lesson plans modified for the English level of each ELL, especially beginning and low intermediate ELLs. | 3.3. Check to make sure teachers are using the ELLs LEP Plan when making lesson plans. | 3.3. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach. | 3.3. Administrative walk throughs, teacher assessments | 3.3. IObservation |
| | | 3.4 ELLs who have been in the program five years or longer. The gap between their grade level and performance is not closing is indicative of an ongoing need for increased intervention with MTSS. | 3.4 MTSS team to address concerns. | 3.4 MTSS personnel | 3.4 Data analysis | 3.4 CELLA Writing |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| High School Mathematics Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. | | | 1.1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning. | 1.1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student progress (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System) | 1.1. School administration and classroom teacher | 1.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration | 1.1. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| Mathematics Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| <i>The percentage of student scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the FAA will increase.</i> | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 77% (7).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 80% (3).</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced | 1.2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System) | 1.2. School administration and classroom teacher | 1.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration. | 1.2. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 1.3. Students may struggle to retain content that they have already learned. | 1.3. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students review content, organize students to practice and deepen knowledge, and practice skills, strategies, and processes. | 1.3. School administration and classroom teacher | 1.3. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration | 1.3. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2: <i>N/A: None of the students are performing higher than the Supported level at YHS.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3: <i>The percentage of students making learning gains on the FAA will increase.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 57% (4).</i> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 80% (3).</i> | 3.1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning. | 3.1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student progress (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework). | 3.1. School administration and classroom teacher | 3.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration | 3.1. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 3.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced | 3.2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework) | 3.2. School administration and classroom teacher | 3B. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration. | 32. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. |

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| Algebra 1 EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1. | | | 1.1. Students may fail to see the connection between classroom activities and learning goals. | 1.1. Teachers will develop clearly stated learning goals accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance to help students see the connections between classroom activities and learning goals. (Marzano’s Art and Science of Teaching Framework) | 1.1. Student, Teacher, and Administrator | 1.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs | 1.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs, Algebra 1 EOC |
| Algebra 1 Goal #1: <i>Increase the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 on the Algebra EOC</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance :* — | 2013 Expected Level of Performance :* — | | | | | |
| | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 31% (67).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 34% (77).</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2 Students may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests. | 1.2 Teacher will make connections between students’ interests and class content to engage students in the learning process. (Marzano’s Art and Science of Teaching Framework) | 1.2. Student, Teacher, and Administrator | 1.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs | 1.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs |
| | | | 1.3 Data analysis is necessary to support targeted instruction to improve student achievement. | 1.3.. Teachers will utilize *Study Island, Achieve 3000, and FCAT explorer data to target instruction to improve student achievement | 1.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 1.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs | 1.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| improvement for the following group: | | | | | | | |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1. | | 2.1. Students may not be engaged in cognitively complex tasks. | 2.1. Teachers will incorporate common core state standards for literacy to challenge students to higher levels of achievement. | 2.1. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 2.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 2.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs. Algebra 1 EOC | |
| Algebra Goal #2: <i>The percentage of students scoring 4 or above on the Algebra 1 EOC will increase.</i> | <u>2012</u> Current Level of Performance .* -- | <u>2013</u> Expected Level of Performance .* -- | | | | | |
| | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 21% (48).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 23% (52).</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. Students may need assistance to interact with new knowledge. | 2.2. Teachers will implement Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework and the associated research-based instructional strategies in every classroom. | 2.2. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 2.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 2.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs |
| | | 2.3. Assessments from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need technology support. | 2.3. Request district assistance for technology support. | 2.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator, District Technology Department | 2.3. Request district assistance | 2.3. Request district assistance | |
| Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years | | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| 3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 | BLACK 60% | BLACK 60% | BLACK 64% | BLACK 68% | BL. 72% | BL. 76% |
| | | HISPANIC 89% | HISPANIC 53% | HISPANIC 57% | HISPANIC 62% | HISP. 67% | HISP. 72% |
| | | WHITE 75% | WHITE 70% | WHITE 73% | WHITE 76% | WH. 79% | WH. 82% |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|------------------------|----------|--|--|
| Algebra 1 Goal #3A: | | | | | | | | | | |
| The achievement gap for the following subgroups will decrease. | | | SWD 58% | SWD 43% | SWD 49% | SWD 60% | SWD 60% | SWD 66% | | |
| | | | ECON. Dis. 68% | ECON. DIS. 68% | ECON. DIS. 73% | ECON. DIS. 75% | E.D. 78% | E.D. 81% | | |
| BLACK 52% | | | | | | | | | | |
| HISPANIC 43 % | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHITE 64% | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD 40% | | | | | | | | | | |
| ECON. Dis. 53% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | |
| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. | | | 3B.1. All sub groups struggle due to inadequate progress monitoring and remediation of deficient skills. | 3B.1. Teacher will utilize district purchased software programs to provide baseline and midyear assessment, to monitor student progress, to remediate skills, and to provide test preparation. | 3B.1. Classroom teacher and school administration | 3B.1. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs | 3B.1. Algebra EOC Exam | | | |
| Algebra 1 Goal | | | 2012 Current Level of Performance | 2013 Expected Level of Performance | | | | | | |
| The overall percentage of students not making satisfactory progress will decrease. | | | :* | :* | | | | | | |
| | | | N/A Data unable to be retrieved. | N/A Data unable to be retrieved | | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2. Sub groups struggle to set learning goals and to comprehend new content. | 3B.2. Teachers communicate learning goals and scales and track student progress. Work with students to interact with new knowledge by identifying critical information, | 3B.2. Classroom teacher and school administration | 3B.2. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs | 3B.2. Algebra EOC Exam | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------|
| | | | organizing students to interact with new knowledge, previewing new content, chunking content into digestible bites, and processing new information. | | | |
| | | 3B.3. Sub groups struggle to retain content that they have previously learned. | 3B.3. Help students practice and deepen knowledge by reviewing content, organizing students to practice and deepen knowledge, and practicing skills, strategies, and processes. | 3B.3. Classroom teacher and school administration | 3B.3. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs | 3B.3. Algebra EOC Exam |
| | | 3B.4. Teachers need greater number of teaching tools and strategies to address deficiencies in subgroups. | 3B.4 Teachers will continue training in Marzano strategies for increased student achievement. | 3B.4 Classroom teacher and school administration | 3B.4 Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs | 3B.4 Algebra EOC Exam |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. | | | 3C.1. ELLs have not had enough time in the ESOL program to become proficient with English to pass the test. Average time for ELLs to be proficient is 3-5 years. However, each ELL is different based on support from home and literacy levels of parents. | 3C.1. Teachers and ELL paraprofessional will continue to work with ELLs at their level, making the needed accommodations with the content area material. Involve ELLs in Community in Schools for reinforcement and assistance with assignments and homework. | 3C.1. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach. | 3C. 1. Data analysis | 3C.1. Ongoing progressing monitoring data |
| Algebra 1 Goal #3C: The percentage of ELL students passing the Alg 1 EOC will increase. | <table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>2012</u> Current Level of Performance .*</td> <td><u>2013</u> Expected Level of Performance .*</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>9-12: Alg 1 EOC 3 out of 6 ELLs taking the test passed=50%</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></td> </tr> </table> | <u>2012</u> Current Level of Performance .* | | | | | |
| <u>2012</u> Current Level of Performance .* | <u>2013</u> Expected Level of Performance .* | | | | | | |
| <i>9-12: Alg 1 EOC 3 out of 6 ELLs taking the test passed=50%</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | | | |
| | | | 3C2. Not enough ESOL endorsed teachers who know strategies when working with ELLs at the different English levels. | 3C.2. Provide more ESOL endorsed teachers for ELLs at schools with a large ELL population. | 3C.2. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach. | 3C.2. Staff certifications | 3C.2. Staff certifications |
| | | | 3C.3. Lesson plans will be modified for the English level of each ELL, especially beginning and low intermediate ELLs. | 3C.3. Check to make sure teachers are using the ELLs LEP Plan when making lesson plans. | 3C.3. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach. | 3C.3. Review of lesson plans | 3C.3. Ongoing progressing monitoring data |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | 3C.4 ELLs who have been in the program five years or longer. The gap between their grade level and performance is not closing is indicative of an ongoing need for increased intervention with MTSS. | 3C: 4 MTSS team to address concerns | 3C:4 MTSS personnel | 3C:4 Review individual progress monitoring plans. | 3C:4 Ongoing progressing monitoring data |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. | | | 3D.1. The SWD population may have a broad range of needs and accommodations. | 3D.1. Teachers will identify needs of SWD and provide accommodations and modifications specific to each student. | 3D.1. Classroom teachers and school administration | 3D.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring | 3D.1. In class assessments and Algebra 1 EOC |
| Algebra 1 Goal #3D: The percentage of SWD students passing the Alg 1 EOC will increase. | <u>2012</u> <u>Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance</u> :* | <u>2013</u> <u>Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance</u> :* | | | | | |
| | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 60% (9).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 57% (11).</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 3D.2. Teachers will provide SWD with repetition and reinforcement for skill development. | 3D.2. Classroom teachers | 3D.2. In class assessments and progress monitoring. | 3D.2. In class assessments and FCAT | 3D.2. In class assessments and Algebra 1 EOC |
| | | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|-------------------|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. | | | 3E.1. Teachers may be unaware of the situations faced by ED students. | 3E.1. Identify and consider needs of ED students and provide accommodations as needed. | 3E.1. Classroom teachers | 3E.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring | 3E.1. Algebra EOC |
| Algebra 1 Goal #3E: | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | | | | | |
| The overall percentage of students not making satisfactory progress will decrease | <u>Current Level of Performance</u> | <u>Expected Level of Performance</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>N/A: Data unable to be retrieved.</i> | <i>N/A: Data unable to be retrieved.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. |
| | | | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | 3E.3. |

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| Geometry EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | | 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. | | | 1.1. Students may fail to see the connection between classroom activities and learning goals. | 1.1. Teachers will develop clearly stated learning goals accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance to help students see the connections between classroom activities and learning goals. (Marzano’s Art and Science of Teaching Framework) |
| Geometry Goal #1: <i>N/A there are no level 3 students. This was reported as a T score.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance :* <hr/> <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 35% (70).</i> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance :* <hr/> <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 39% (25).</i> | 1.2 Students may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests. | 1.2 Teacher will make connections between students’ interests and class content to engage students in the learning process. (Marzano’s Art and Science of Teaching Framework) | 1.2. Student, Teacher, and Administrator | 1.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs | 1.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs, Geometry EOC |
| | | | 1.3 Data analysis is necessary to support targeted instruction to improve student achievement. | 1.3.. Teachers will utilize *Study Island, Achieve 3000, and FCAT explorer data to target instruction to improve student achievement | 1.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 1.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs | 1.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs, Geometry EOC |
| | | | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | 1.4 Insufficient teacher knowledge of research based, highly effective instructional strategies. | 1.4. Teachers will continue training in Marzano strategies for increased student achievement. | 1.4. Classroom teacher and school administration | 1.4. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs | 1.4. Geometry EOC Exam |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. | | 2.1. Students may not be engaged in cognitively complex tasks. | 2.1. Teachers will incorporate common core state standards for literacy to challenge students to higher levels of achievement. | 2.1. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 2.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 2.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs Geometry EOC |
| Geometry Goal #2: | 2012 Current Level of Performance .* .* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance .* .* | | | | |
| <i>N/A there are no 4/5 students. This was reported as a T score.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. Students may need assistance to interact with new knowledge. | 2.2. Teachers will implement Marzano’s Art and Science of Teaching Framework and the associated research-based instructional strategies in every classroom. | 2.2. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 2.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs |
| | | | 2.3. Assessments from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need technology support. | 2.3. Request district assistance for technology support. | 2.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator, District Technology Department | 2.3. Request district assistance |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|------------------------|
| | | 2.4. Insufficient teacher knowledge of research based, highly effective instructional strategies. | 2.4. Teacher will continue training in Marzano strategies for increased student achievement. | 2.4. Classroom teacher and school administration | 2.4. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs | 2.4. Geometry EOC Exam |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|------------------------|

| Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years | | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|-------------------------|
| 3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Geometry Goal #3A: <i>The achievement gap for the following subgroups will decrease.</i> BLACK 52% HISPANIC 43 % WHITE 64% SWD 40% ECON. Dis. 53% | Baseline data 2011-2012 | BLACK 60% | BLACK 64% | BLACK 68% | BL. 72% | BL. 76% |
| | | HISPANIC 53% | HISPANIC 57 % | HISPANIC 62% | HISP. 67% | HISP. 72% |
| | | WHITE 70% | WHITE 73% | WHITE 76% | WH. 79% | WH. 82% |
| | | SWD 43% | SWD 49% | SWD 60% | SWD 60% | SWD 66% |
| | | ECON. DIS. 68% | ECON. DIS. 73% | ECON. DIS. 75% | E.D. 78% | E.D. 81% |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B: The overall percentage of students not making | 2012 <u>Current</u> Level of Performance .:* - | 2013 <u>Expected</u> Level of Performance .:* - | 3B.1. Teacher will utilize district purchased software programs to provide baseline and midyear assessment, to monitor student progress, to remediate skills, and to provide test preparation. All sub groups struggle due | 3B.1. Classroom teacher and school administration | 3B.1. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs | 3B.1. Geometry EOC Exam |

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------------------------|
| satisfactory progress will decrease | <i>N/A: Data unable to be retrieved.</i> | <i>N/A: Data unable to be retrieved.</i> | to inadequate progress monitoring and remediation of deficient skills. | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2. Sub groups struggle to set learning goals and to comprehend new content. | 3B.2. Teachers communicate learning goals and scales and track student progress. Work with students to interact with new knowledge by identifying critical information, organizing students to interact with new knowledge, previewing new content, chunking content into digestible bites, and processing new information. | 3B.2. Classroom teacher and school administration | 3B.2. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs | 3B.2. Geometry EOC Exam |
| | | | 3B.3. Sub groups struggle to retain content that they have previously learned. | 3B.3. Help students practice and deepen knowledge by reviewing content, organizing students to practice and deepen knowledge, and practicing skills, strategies, and processes. | 3B.3. Classroom teacher and school administration | 3B.3. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs | 3B.3. Geometry EOC Exam |
| | | | 3B.4. Teachers need greater number of teaching tools and strategies to address deficiencies in subgroups. | 3B.4 Teachers will continue training in Marzano strategies for increased student achievement. | 3B.4 Classroom teacher and school administration | 3B.4 Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs | 3B.4 Geometry EOC Exam |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. | | | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #3C: N/A | <u>2012</u> Current Level of Performance .* _ | <u>2013</u> Expected Level of Performance .* _ | | | | | |
| | <i>No ELLs took the Geometry EOC in 2011-2012</i> | <i>No ELL students are enrolled in Geometry for the 2012-2013 school year.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. | | | 3D.1. The SWD population may have a broad range of needs and accommodations. | 3D.1. Teachers will identify needs of SWD and provide accommodations and modifications specific to each student. | 3D.1. Classroom teachers and school administration | 3D.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring | 3D.1. In class assessments and Geometry EOC |
| Geometry Goal #3D: <i>The percentage of students with disabilities (SWD) making satisfactory progress in Geometry will increase.</i> | <u>2012</u> Current Level of Performance .* _ | <u>2013</u> Expected Level of Performance .* _ | | | | | |
| | <i>N/A Data Unable to be retrieved.</i> | <i>N/A Data Unable to be retrieved.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. SWD may learn at a slower rate. | 5D.2. Teachers will provide SWD with repetition and reinforcement for skill | 5D.2. Classroom teachers | 5D.2. In class assessments and progress monitoring. | 5D.2. In class assessments and Geometry EOC |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | | development. | | | |
| | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. | | | 3E.1. Teachers may be unaware of the situations faced by ED students. | 3E.1. Teachers will identify and consider needs of ED students and provide interventions as needed. | 3E.1. Classroom teachers | 3E.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring | 3E.1. Geometry EOC |
| Geometry Goal #3E: <i>The percentage of economically disadvantaged (ED) not making satisfactory progress will decrease.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance :* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance :* | | | | | |
| | N/A Data Unable to be retrieved. | N/A Data Unable to be retrieved. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Ongoing professional development utilizing iObservation resource library | All | School administration, department chairs | School wide | Monthly at staff and department meetings | Classroom walkthroughs by school administration | School administration and classroom teacher |

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|--------------------------|--------------------|---|--|---|
| District provided training on Marzano design questions and elements for Domain 1 | All | Staff Development Office | District wide | Professional development day and summer workshops | Classroom walkthroughs by school administration | School administration and classroom teacher |
| Common Core Standards: An Overview | 6-12 | Beacon Educator | Secondary Teachers | Fall/Winter 2012 | Review of Professional Activity Implementation report. | Staff Development Administration |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| High School Science Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. | | | 11. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning. | 1.1. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and scales (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System , Marzano’s Art and Science of Teacher Framework), and will utilize district purchased programs and software to track student progress. | 1. 1. School administration and classroom teacher | 1.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration | 1.1. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| <u>Science Goal #1:</u> | <u>2012</u> <u>Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance</u> :* -- | <u>2013</u> <u>Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance</u> :* -- | | | | | |
| <i>The percentage of students scoring at a Level 4, 5, or 6 on the FAA will increase.</i> | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 100% (2).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 100% (6).</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced | 1.2. Teachers will help students identify critical information, organize new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information(PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano’s Art and Science of Teacher Framework) | 1.2. School administration and classroom teacher | 1.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration. | 1.2. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 13. Students may struggle to retain content that they have already learned. | 1.3. Teachers will help students review content, practice and deepen knowledge, practice skills, strategies, and processes. (Marzano’s Art and Science of Teacher Framework) | 1.3. School administration and classroom teacher | 1.3. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration | 1.3. Florida Alternate Assessment |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. | | | | | | | |
| Science Goal #2: <i>N/A: None of the students are performing higher than the Supported level at YHS.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| Biology 1 EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1. | | | | | | | |
| Biology 1 Goal #1: <i>N/A there are no level 3 students. This was reported as a T score.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | 1.1. Students may fail to see the connection between classroom activities and learning goals. | 1.1. Teachers will develop clearly stated learning goals accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance to help students see the connections between classroom activities and learning goals. (Marzano’s Art and Science of Teaching Framework) | 1.1. Student, Teacher, and Administrator | 1.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs. | 1.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs, Biology 1 EOC |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | 1.2 Students may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests. | 1.2 Teacher will make connections between students' interests and class content to engage students in the learning process. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework) | 1.2. Student, Teacher, and Administrator | 1.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 1.2. 1.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs |
| | | 1.3 Data analysis is necessary to support targeted instruction to improve student achievement. | 1.3. Teachers will utilize *Study Island, Achieve 3000, and FCAT explorer data to target instruction to improve student achievement | 1.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 1.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 1.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1. | | 2.1. Students may not be engaged in cognitively complex tasks. | 2.1. Teachers will incorporate common core state standards for literacy to challenge students to higher levels of achievement. | 2.1. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 2.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 2.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs Biology EOC |
| Biology 1 Goal #2: <i>N/A there are no 4/5 students. This was reported as a T score.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | n/a | n/a | | | | |
| | | 2.2. Students may need assistance to interact with new knowledge. | 2.2. Teachers will implement Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework and the associated research-based instructional strategies in every classroom. | 2.2. Student, Teacher and Administrator | 2.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs | 2.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs 2.2. |
| | | 2.3. Assessments from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer | 2.3. Request district assistance for technology support. | 2.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator, District Technology Department | 2.3. Request district assistance | 2.3. Request district assistance |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | access and technological support. Teachers may need technology support. | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|

End of Biology I EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Marzano's High Yield Strategies | All grade levels. | Principal | All teachers. | Periodically throughout the school year during Faculty or PLC meetings. | Observation | Principal, Assistant Principal, and Teacher. |
| Study Island | All grade levels. | Laura Graham | All teachers. | Pre-planning. | Data analysis | Principal, Assistant Principal, and Teacher. |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Other | | | |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of Science Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| Writing Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. | | | 1A.1. Training needed in the new writing requirements with an emphasis on conventions, and quality of support with specific and relevant supporting details. | 1A.1. Teachers will use writing across the curriculum with common writing rubrics. Implement CCSS writing standards. Use 2012 FCAT Writing Anchor Sets for staff development. | 1A.1. Students, Teachers, and Administrator | 1A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs | 1A.1 Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs |
| <u>Writing Goal #1A:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> .* _ | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> .* _ | | | | | |
| <i>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 will increase.</i> | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 85% (226).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 88% (257).</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2. All teachers need instructional strategies on giving quality feedback on student writing. | 1A.2. Teachers will focus on learning targets with clear and specific feedback. And use common writing rubrics. | 1A.2. Students, Teachers, and Administrator | 1A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs | 1A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs |
| | | | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. | | | 1B.1. Training needed in the writing with an emphasis on conventions, and quality of support with specific and relevant supporting details. | 1B.1. Teachers will use writing across the curriculum. Use common writing rubrics. | 1B.1. Students, Teachers, and Administrator | 1B.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs | 1B.1 Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs |
| <u>Writing Goal #1B:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> .* _ | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> .* _ | | | | | |
| <i>The percentage of students scoring a level 4 on the FCAT Writing will increase.</i> | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 24% (64).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 27% (79).</i> | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. |
| | | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. |

Writing Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | |
| FCAT 2.0 Writing | 4, 8, 10 | District Staff | ELA teachers | Fall 2012 | Student Data | Administration | |
| Common Core Standards: An Overview | 6-12 | Beacon Educator | Secondary Teachers | Fall/Winter 2012 | Review of Professional Activity Implementation report. | Staff Development Administration | |
| | | | | | | | |

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

End of Writing Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| Civics EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Civics Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Civics Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Civics Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| U.S. History EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| U.S. History Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| U.S. History Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

U.S. History Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of U.S. History Goals

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| Attendance Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Attendance | | | 1.1. Students often do not see the importance of attending school on a regular basis. | 1.1. Student conference to show the direct relation between academic success and future success within society. Refer to the MTSS team. | 1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Guidance Counselors, and MTSS team | 1.1 Monitor attendance rate within FOCUS. | Reports generated from FOCUS. |
| Attendance Goal #1: | <u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:</u> * | <u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:</u> * | | | | | |
| <i>The current level of attendance will improve.</i> | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 90% (945).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 91% (1000).</i> | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 7% (69).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 6% (66).</i> | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 5% (53).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 4% (44).</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of Attendance Goals

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Suspension Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

| Suspension Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Suspension | | | 1.1. Students often lack self-control within the learning environment. | 1.1. Refer to the MTSS team for behavior management. Complete a Sutton Place Referral with the on-campus counselor. | 1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Guidance Counselors, and MTSS team | 1.1 Monitor student behavior rate within FOCUS. | Reports generated from FOCUS. |
| Suspension Goal #1: | 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| <i>Reduce the total number of suspensions during the school year.</i> | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 14% (25).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 12% (22).</i> | | | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School | | | | | | |
| <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 3% (32).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 2% (22).</i> | | | | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | | | |
| <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 8% (23).</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 7% (12).</i> | | | | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | | | | | | |
| <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 1% (16)</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 1% (11).</i> | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Suspension Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of Suspension Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

| Dropout Prevention Goal(s) | | Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|----------------------|---|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1. Dropout Prevention | | 1.1. Students have been retained two or more grade levels behind their kindergarten cohort. | 1.1 Monitor "at risk" cohort and implement interventions as needed. | 1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Guidance Counselors, and MTSS team | 1.1 Review dropout rates. | Graduation Rate | |
| <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> <i>The percentage of students completing high school will increase.</i> | <u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u> | | | | | | <u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u> |
| | <i>The dropout rate for 2012 was 1% (2).</i> | | | | | | <i>The expected dropout rate for 2013 will be .05% (2).</i> |
| | <u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u> | | | | | | <u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u> |
| | <i>The graduation rate for 2012 was 99% (190).</i> | | | | | | <i>The graduation rate for 2013 will be 99% (233).</i> |
| | | 1.2. Lack of motivation to complete course of study. | 1.2. Credit recovery programs: EdOptions, NCAH, virtual educational programs. | 1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Guidance Counselors, and MTSS team | 1.2.Review transcripts. | 1.2. Graduation Rate | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.

Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

| Parent Involvement Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Parent Involvement | | | 1.1. Effective communication hampered by conflicting schedules. | 1. Parent Newsletters, School Reach, FOCUS, Edline , school website, Study Island, School Advisory Council, Booster Clubs, Open House, SIP meetings, new student orientation, climate surveys and volunteer training. | 1.1. Administrators | 1.1. Results of climate surveys, informal feedback from stakeholders, sign in sheets, | 1.1. Analyze data |
| <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> | | | | | |
| <u>Increase the number of parents involved, and/or participating in school related activities</u> | <i>The 2012 current level of performance was 2589 hours</i> | <i>The 2013 expected level of performance will be 3000 hours.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2 | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

Parent Involvement Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Parent Involvement Budget

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| STEM Goal #1: Increase professional development opportunities for teachers that change instructional practice as it relates to effective integration of STEM across the curriculum. | 1.1 Additional professional development opportunities are necessary for program development and implementation. | 1.1. Provide professional development for interdisciplinary units with a focus on STEM. | 1.1. Administration and Leadership team. | 1.1. Review of professional development implementation activities completed by participants. | 1.1. Professional Development Implementation Report |
| | 1.2 | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| | | | | | |

STEM Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of STEM Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

| CTE Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| CTE Goal #1: <u>Increase the number of students successfully completing industry certification in career technical programs.</u> | 1.1 The inability for students to meet program eligibility requirements. | 1.1. Provide students with additional support with courses such as Intensive Reading, Math for College Success, Math for College Readiness, and English 4 Florida College Prep. | 1.1. Administration, Guidance Department, | 1.1. Analyzing the percentage of CTE students earning Industry Certification | 1.1 Industry Certification Exams. |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | | | |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

CTE Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of CTE Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

| Additional Goal(s) | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Additional Goal | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Additional Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

Additional Goals Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of Additional Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Please provide the total budget from each section. | |
| Reading Budget | Total: |
| CELLA Budget | Total: |
| Mathematics Budget | Total: |
| Science Budget | Total: |
| Writing Budget | Total: |
| Civics Budget | Total: |
| U.S. History Budget | Total: |
| Attendance Budget | Total: |
| Suspension Budget | Total: |
| Dropout Prevention Budget | Total: |
| Parent Involvement Budget | Total: |
| STEM Budget | Total: |
| CTE Budget | Total: |
| Additional Goals | Total: |
| | Grand Total: |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school’s DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under “Default value” header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an “x” in the box.)

| School Differentiated Accountability Status | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Priority | <input type="checkbox"/> Focus | <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent |
| | | |

Are you reward school? Yes No ***Grades for high schools of the 2011-2012 have not been released.**
 (A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community members who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting *Yes* or *No* below.

x Yes No

| |
|---|
| If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements. |
| |

| |
|--|
| Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year. |
| |

| Describe the projected use of SAC funds. | Amount |
|--|--------|
| | |
| | |
| | |